



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL Historic District

3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

VOICE 410-313-2350

FAX 410-313-3042

September Minutes

Thursday, September 1, 2016; 7:00 p.m.

The eighth regular meeting for the year 2016 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, September 1, 2016 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland. Ms. Tennor moved to approve the August 4, 2016 minutes. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Members present: Allan Shad, Chair; Eileen Tennor, Vice-Chair; Drew Roth, Secretary; Erica Zoren, Bruno Reich

Staff present: Samantha Holmes, Beth Burgess, Dan Bennett, Lewis Taylor, and Yvette Zhou

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 16-09c – 8098 Main Street, Ellicott City
2. 16-03c – 8329-8333 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 16-59 – 3880 Ellicott Mills Drive, Ellicott City, HO-315
4. 16-60 – 8518 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. 16-61 – 1805 Marriottsville Road, Ellicott City, HO-191
6. 16-62 – 6130 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge
7. 16-63 – 8307 Main Street, Ellicott City
8. 16-64 – 8435 Frederick Road, Ellicott City
9. 16-65 – 8289 Main Street, Ellicott City (emergency addition)
10. 16-66 – 8098 Main Street, Ellicott City (emergency addition)

CONSENT AGENDA

16-09c – 8098 Main Street, Ellicott City

Final tax credit claim.

Applicant: Jackie Everett

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant was pre-approved for tax credits to replace the marble step on April 7, 2016. The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$7,083.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$1,770.75 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approve and the receipts and paid invoice adds up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve per Staff recommendations. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-03c – 8329-8333 Main Street, Ellicott City

Final tax credit claim.

Applicant: Brennan + company architects on behalf of David Stewart

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. The Applicant was pre-approved for tax credits to remove and replace the porch roof with a copper roof on February 4, 2016. The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$8,470.08 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$2,117.52 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approve and the paid invoice adds up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve per Staff recommendations. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

16-59 – 3880 and 3884 Ellicott Mills Drive

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Lisa Wingate

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1800. The Applicant seeks approval for the following work:

- 1) Change coating on front steps to a brown/taupe stain.
- 2) Change materials of the previously approved fence and retaining wall extending west from barn to be a black metal fence on top of a low stack stone retaining wall. There will not be any change in the length of the fence or retaining wall. There will be a 36 inch black metal fence installed on top of a low stone retaining wall. The retaining wall will be about 8-12 inches above grade. The wall will match other stone walls constructed on the property.
- 3) Retroactively approve change of material for the previously approved west garden arbor arches to rebar, which will weather and rust naturally and white stained pressure treated wood frame.
- 4) Retroactively approve installation of low, L-shaped, natural stone retaining wall to hold back hillside above the arbor. Walkway paving will be flagstone and pea gravel.



Figure 1 - Items 3 and 4

Staff Comments: Item #1 does not require approval as long as the color of the stain is the same as the color previously approved; the change in the stain product does not require approval.

Item #2, the construction of the stone wall and black metal fence and Items #3 and #4, the arbor and L-shaped wall/terrace, complies with Chapter 9.D recommendations, “construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way” and “construct new terraces or patios visible from a public way from brick, stone or concrete pavers designed to look like indigenous stone.” The terrace and arbor will not be visible from a public way, but was built using wood, stone and metal, all materials that are compatible with the surrounding historic setting and buildings. The black metal fencing complies with Chapter 9.D, “install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, or wood or dark metal.” The fence will be constructed of black metal and will be similar to other metal fences in Ellicott City.

This project has come before the Commission 17 times, including final tax credit claims. Applications need to be submitted to the Commission prior to work being done.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Lisa Wingate. Mr. Shad asked why there was another application before the Commission for retroactive approval. Ms. Wingate said this was an extremely complex project that has been taking place over six years and the owners have been very careful seeking approval from the Commission for every step. She explained at times when a contractor is on site a decision needs to be made and instead of ceasing work, the contractors and the owner make the best decision possible. When installing the arbor it was discovered that a small retaining wall was needed. The wall was shallow and not visible from offsite and the design followed all Guidelines. Ms. Wingate explained that the owners should have obtained pre-approval but it would have stopped construction and delayed move in date. Mr. Shad emphasized the Commission can deny decisions on all retroactive items. Ms. Wingate understood and commented that the on-site decisions did not affect the historic resource. The small retaining wall was done adhering to Historic District Guidelines with in-kind materials.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve as submitted. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-60 – 8518 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations and repairs.

Applicant: Gary Mapp, Howard County Housing Commission

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the house dates to 1891. The Applicant originally proposed to remove the picket and split rail fence in the rear of the property and replace it with a solid vertical board fence to be privacy height to match the previous fence. Currently the rear fence no longer exists due to the July 30 flood. The new fence will be stained dark brown to match the current solid and vertical board on the side of the house. There is a white, wood picket fence in the front yard that was damaged in the flood. This fencing will be replaced to match the existing fence.



Figure 2 - Front of house

The Applicant also proposes to replace the roof and replace broken windows in the second floor front bedroom. The existing gray 3 tab asphalt shingle roof will be replaced with a CertainTeed gray 3 tab asphalt shingle roof to match the existing. The existing windows are a wood 1:1 window painted white. The broken windows are the left and middle window. The Applicant said that the window balances are broken and the glass is missing in one window pane. The Applicant will replace the two broken windows with a 1:1 Andersen 200 series vinyl clad wood window, painted white to match the existing.

Staff Comments: The Applicant proposes to replace the fencing in the rear with a closed board fence. Prior to the flood there was a portion of fencing that was a closed board privacy fence. The Applicant's insurance company has expressed concern with the stream behind the property and is requiring the fence be constructed. Chapter 9.D recommends, "install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal. Use closed wood fences only for side and rear yards in areas where a precedent exists. Construct closed wood fences of painted vertical boards, with straight or angled rather than scalloped tops." The style of vertical board fence chosen by the Applicant will match the style recommended in Chapter 9.D (page 68) of the Guidelines. While the Guidelines recommend painting the vertical board fences, Staff finds the natural wood blends in with the surrounding better for a rear yard fence and painting is most appropriate for a front picket fence, as submitted.

Chapter 6.H of the Guidelines recommends, "maintain and repair original window openings, frames, sashes, sills, lintels and trim. Maintain glass, putty and paint in good condition. Install weather stripping to reduce air infiltration." Staff recommends the windows be repaired if possible. Chapter 6.H states, "when repair is not possible, replace original windows, frames and related details with features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, material, finish and window pane configuration. If possible, reproduce frame size and profile and muntin detailing." The existing windows are wood. Staff finds if the windows are not able to be repaired and are replaced they should be replaced only in wood to match the existing, without a vinyl clad exterior.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of the fencing as submitted. Staff recommends the window be repaired if possible; if not possible then Staff recommends the windows be replaced with wood windows without a vinyl clad exterior.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Mr. Gary Mapp. Mr. Mapp said the cladding around the windows is a permanent coating to match the window trim. He said there is existing white trim around the window so the cladding will be white to match. Ms. Tennor asked if the window can be repaired rather than replaced. Mr. Mapp said the issue is the existing windows have the old rope and pulley system and said it is difficult to find a repairman who knows how to repair them. He said the proposed replacement Andersen 200 window are wood with vinyl cladding. Mr. Reich said that Andersen also makes an all wood window with a factory coated polyurethane based paint that is just as durable as the vinyl. Mr. Reich said the window should be repaired if at all possible rather than replaced and that a repairman is not hard to find. Mr. Mapp stated the house is over 100 years old and that replacement with energy efficient products is important. Ms. Tennor said wood windows are very energy efficient. The Commission agreed the window should be repaired and only replaced if it cannot be repaired. Mr. Mapp stated he will try to repair the window and if it cannot be repaired Mr. Mapp would use an all wooden window without cladding and paint the exterior trim white. The Commission had no objections to the proposed fencing.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to Approve per Staff recommendations and leave it to Staff to approve an appropriate window repair or replacement. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-61 – 1805 Marriottsville Road, Marriottsville, HO-191

Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Shelly Levey

Background & Scope of Work: This property is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-191. According to SDAT the house dates to 1850. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the following repairs:

- 1) Repair the front brick steps. The bottom brick step will be removed and the area will be excavated 30 inches down to pour concrete footing. A new brick step will be built.
- 2) Repair the foundation on the right side of the carport. The contractor will dig down 30 inches along 10 linear feet of the stone foundation, add ½ inch of cement parging and apply foundation tar to wall and back fill with dirt to grade.
- 3) In the basement the contractor will add four 10-foot long, 6x6 inch and two 10-foot long, 2x8 inch floor joists to the existing joist supporting the first floor office.
- 4) Repair crack in mud room foundation.
- 5) Install block retaining wall/cement lip at top of areaway steps. Mortar and cinder blocks to be repaired/replaced.
- 6) Repair door jamb at the bottom of the basement step with wood.
- 7) Repair smoke house door jamb in-kind with wood
- 8) Stone wall under front porch to be repaired.
- 9) Beam under front porch to be repaired.
- 10) Carport stones between kitchen and carport stairs to be mortared to prevent water from entering basement.



Figure 4 - Mudroom foundation crack



Figure 3 - Cement lip/retaining wall



Figure 6 - Alternate view of cement lip/retaining wall



Figure 5 - Crack in carport allowing water into basement

Staff Comments: The application is consistent with Section 20.112 of the County Code which state that eligible work for tax credits includes, “the repair or replacement of exterior features of the structure” and “work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability or weatherproofing.” The front steps will be removed and replaced in-kind to match the existing. The majority of the work involves waterproofing the foundation or otherwise making exterior alterations to keep water from flowing into the basement. The interior repairs to the first floor office joists and porch beam address structural issues with the historic home and the repairs are necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: The Applicant was not present. Mr. Shad asked if the Commission members had any questions or comments. Mr. Reich said it looked like straightforward maintenance and repair work. Ms. Tennor stated she did not see any problems.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve as submitted per Staff recommendation. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-62 – 6130 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Daniel Roth

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Lawyers Hill Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes the following work:

- 1) Remove two windows on the east side of the house (facing the Assembly Rooms) on the first floor to allow for kitchen cabinets on the interior. Cedar shake siding painted to match the rest of the house will be installed in the window voids.
- 2) Create a driveway using crushed asphalt. The driveway apron at the shared drive will be about 12 feet wide. The driveway will be about 55 feet long and the hammerhead will be about 36 feet in total width and 18 feet wide at each hammerhead end.
- 3) Construct a shed to be located behind the deck on the rear of the house. The picture submitted is similar to what the Applicant intends to build, but is not an exact match. The proposed shed will have cinder block foundation with a mulch flower bed around it to hide the foundation materials. The shed will be about 20 feet by 12 feet. The siding will be wood cedar shake, painted the same color scheme as the main house. The roof will be grey architectural asphalt shingles to match the main house, not a red metal roof as shown in the example. There will not be any lights on the shed, as shown in the example photo.
- 4) Make foundation repairs at the north and west end of the house using cinder block walls installed between the footings 3 feet below grade. The front corner of the house at the vestibule has settled and the Applicant would like to level the floors. The structure will be raised up/elevated and repairs will be made to the footings. The Applicant will build a block wall 3 feet below grade in between the post footings for additional support. The block walls will be covered back up with wood to match the existing exterior. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Staff Comments: The removal of the two windows facing the Assembly Rooms complies with Chapter 6.I recommendations, “maintain existing window openings. If openings must be removed, added or altered to accommodate changes such as the enlargement of the building, limit such changes to the sides or back of buildings. The Applicant previously requested approval to remove windows on a more visible side of the building in order to accommodate the kitchen, but the Commission did not approve that change. This new proposal to remove the windows on the side of the building is more appropriate and complies with the recommendations in the Guidelines.

The proposed crushed asphalt driveway complies with Chapter 9.E, which states, “driveways in the district are generally long (due to substantial house setbacks from the public roads), sometimes winding or circular, narrow and constructed of gravel or asphalt” and recommends “install new driveways that

are narrow (one lane), constructed of dark colored gravel or asphalt.” The crushed asphalt will resemble dark gravel.

The shed will be constructed using the same siding and roof as the main house and may possibly use salvaged windows from the main house. The same color scheme will be used on the shed as well. This complies with Chapter 7.C recommendations, “design new outbuildings to be compatible with the material, color and scale of the existing house, particularly if visible from public roads or neighboring properties” and “locate new outbuildings to the side or rear of the house.” The shed will be located to the rear side of the house that is the least visible from the street, although it may be visible from neighboring properties.

The foundation repairs are eligible for tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code as they are needed for the structural integrity of the building. The repairs will be taking place under the structure and anything that could be visible will be covered with wood to match the exterior of the house. Staff finds this item qualifies as Routine Maintenance to the building.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the foundation repairs.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Ms. Lisa Mogel. Mr. Reich asked if there is an existing driveway. Ms. Mogel said there is a parking pad that is not sufficient and she would like to enlarge it to allow more parking. Ms. Tennor asked for clarity in the driveway dimensions. Ms. Mogel said the driveway dimensions were mentioned in the staff report, and would replace the existing parking pad. Mr. Reich confirmed the driveway was located off a shared driveway and would not be highly visible. Ms. Mogel confirmed that was correct.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve as submitted for the removal of the windows, replacing with siding to match the current siding, the addition of the proposed shed and the addition of the proposed driveway per Staff recommendations and tax credits for the foundation. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-63 – 8307 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Courtney Kehoe

Background & Scope of Work: This building is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1930. The Applicant proposes to replace the glass block windows and metal doors on the rear lower level of the building with a plain glass storefront and double metal entrance doors. There will be two entrances replaced, one set of entrance doors for Linwood Center Boutique and the second set next to the entrance to Hire Power/Insight 180. The Applicant explained, “Hire Power’s door is flanked to the left and Insight 180’s door is flanked on the right. We would replace with windows and connect the interior space as one with the double door entrance in the center.”

Staff Comments: The removal of the glass block windows are consistent with the recommendations in the Guidelines, “replace inappropriate modern windows with windows of appropriate style. If documentary evidence of the original windows is available, choose new windows similar to the original. Otherwise, select windows appropriate to the period and style of the building.” This building was originally used a car dealership/garage and has been converted to the current retail use. The glass block windows were not an appropriate style and the installation of the new double metal doors and plain

storefront window will be more in keeping with the current use of the building and of other historic storefronts in the vicinity. While the Guidelines recommend installing windows, doors or storefront similar to the original, in this instance the original would no longer be appropriate, but the proposed alterations are an improvement that is compatible with the existing building and neighboring historic buildings. Staff also finds the work is eligible for tax credit per Section 20.112 of the County Code, "The repair or replacement of exterior features of the structure."

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Ms. Courtney Kehoe. Mr. Reich asked if the door on the right was the Linwood boutique. Ms. Kehoe said it is the Boutique and it currently only has one single door and the owner would like to make it into a double door and have the two sides mimic each other, while eliminating all block glass. Mr. Reich asked for clarity on the building location. Ms. Kehoe said the building was the back side of the La Palapa restaurant and Su Casa store. Mr. Reich confirmed that the glass block was not original and they are going to replace it with a glass storefront. Ms. Kehoe said that was correct. Mr. Reich asked what the rest of the building looked like. Ms. Kehoe said Su Casa had a similar storefront door. Mr. Reich said the changes would make it more consistent with the rest of the building.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to Approve as submitted. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-64 – 8435 Frederick Road, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Jessica Liang

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1900. The Applicant proposes the following work:

- 1) Replace existing German lap wood siding on front façade and corrugated metal sheets on the rest of the building with German lap siding to be painted Bamboo Shoot green (the application mentions a 4 to 6 inch width and the option to use composite siding, but a later email from the Applicant specifies wood German lap, the width needs to be determined).
- 2) Replace the existing asphalt roof with a new asphalt roof.
- 3) All doors to be replaced by 6-paneled doors. The main entrance will be on the west side of the building. The Applicant proposes to remove/or make inoperable the existing 4-panel door on the north/front of the building. Doors to be painted burgundy red.
- 4) Replace the existing 1:1 wood windows with a 6:6 wood window, painted burgundy red.
- 5) Replace the existing 'X' paneled wood shutters with a two panel wood shutter painted burgundy red.



Figure 7 - Existing condition of building

Staff Comments: This building is historic, but has been modified over the years. It was most likely originally part of the mill operation in this area. The front façade has been modified, which is evident from the window and trim in the center of the front of the building, and the seam on the siding directly to the left of the lower left front window (see Figure 8). The wood siding on the front of the building does not appear to be in bad condition and Staff finds the siding should be repaired and only replaced in small areas as needed. There are important trim lines and seams that hint at what this building may have previously looked like that would be lost if the front siding is replaced in entirety. The Applicant is only applying to replace existing items on the building in-kind, but it would be worth considering restoring the building to what it may have looked like originally, with carriage doors on the front of the building. The carriage doors could be modified to open up to a large window, instead of a direct opening into the building. Then it would be more appropriate to remove the siding if a feature was being put back in place, as recommended by the Guidelines.

The corrugated metal on the side of the building will be removed and replaced with wood German lap siding, which complies with Chapter 6.D recommendations, “remove asbestos shingles, aluminum siding or other coverings from historic buildings and repair or restore the original wall material.” Staff inquired if the Applicant has looked under the metal siding to see what is there, but they have not looked yet. The new German lap siding should have the same width as the existing wood siding.

There appear to be window openings on the side of the building have been covered over and the existing window on the east elevation appears to have been shortened. It would be appropriate, per the Guidelines, to restore the enclosed windows and change the shortened window back to the original height. Chapter 6.H states, “restore window openings that have been filled in, using physical, pictorial or documentary evidence to accurately restore the building’s historic appearance.”



Figure 8 - Areas where historic alterations can be seen

However, Staff does not find the proposed 6:6 windows are appropriate. The windows, specifically the second floor windows, are not large enough to have a 6:6 pattern. The first floor windows are also small and it would be very crowded to have a 6:6 window. The existing windows are 1:1, which seems more appropriate given the size of the windows. There were not any photographs provided that shows deterioration of the windows. Staff recommends the windows be repaired and not replaced. Chapter 6.H recommends, “maintain and repair original window openings, frames, sashes, sills, lintels and trim. Maintain glass, putty and paint in good condition. Install weatherstripping to reduce air infiltration.”



Figure 9 - Streetscape with building across the street

The proposed replacement of the X-paneled wood shutters with a two panel wood shutter is appropriate as the Guidelines specify that a paneled shutter is a traditional style. Additionally it would be appropriate to simply remove the shutters and not replace them. The County Architectural Historian said the shutters are not a historic type and that a two panel is more appropriate than the existing

shutter. The neighboring buildings do not have shutters. The Guidelines recommend against, “installing shutters or blinds on a historic building if there is no evidence of their use during the historic period.” The lower level of the façade is the portion of the building that was most likely altered, so the shutters are most likely not original. However, they have existed on the building for a long period of time and it would also be acceptable to replace them with a more traditional style.

The existing 4-panel door on the front of the building is also shown in the Guidelines as an appropriate style of door. Staff would need access to the building for the Architectural Historian to determine if the front 4-panel door is an original opening, or part of the façade being altered. From the lack of disruption around the siding in that area, it appears it may be an original opening. The door also appears in good condition. This door may be one of the more historic remaining elements on the building. Staff recommends the door be retained, unless determined by the Architectural Historian to be a modern alteration. Staff also finds that any new doors on the building should match the style of this 4-panel door, which is a more historic style than the proposed 6-panel door. Chapter 6.G recommends against, “unnecessarily replacing original doors and entrance features on historic buildings” and “using doors or door frames that are overly decorative, out of character with the style of the building, or imitative of styles that do not fit the period or style of architecture.” The building directly across the street, also possibly associated with the mill, has the same style of door.

The proposed paint color for the siding is a muted green and the windows, shutters and door are proposed to be a dark burgundy red. The proposed colors do not comply with the Guidelines, “use colors that were historically used on the building” and “use colors appropriate to the period and style of the building.” This building was most likely an industrial use corresponding to the mill activities across the street or an agricultural building for livestock. The proposed color scheme is grander than this building would have had. The Applicant submitted photos of the building directly across the street, which as mentioned above was also most likely associated with the mill. This building has white trim and gray/blue siding. The colors across the street are simple and more appropriate for this style of building. The proposed green would also be more appropriate with white trim, rather than the proposed burgundy trim which will stand out. The building is located in an area with a lot of tree cover and the green could blend in to the surroundings. Staff recommends a color scheme to match the building across the street be used (as they may have been similar in design and style if they were both associated with the mill), which would comply with Chapter 6.N recommendations referenced above and “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings.”

The replacement of the existing asphalt roof with a new asphalt roof is considered Routine Maintenance, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors windows...using the same materials and design.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends:

- 1) Approval of repairing the German lap wood siding on the front of the building, with limited replacement for rotten siding only and approval of replacing the metal on the rest of the building with German lap wood siding. The width of any new siding should match the existing siding. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for this work.
- 2) Replace the existing asphalt roof with a new asphalt roof. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for this work.
- 3) Denial of replacing the doors with a 6-panel door, but approval to repair the existing door and use the 4-panel style for any new wood doors. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for this work.

- 4) Denial of replacing the windows with a 6:6 window, but approval to replace any windows that were covered over with a 1:1 wood window. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for this work and for any repairs to the existing windows.
- 5) Approval replacing the shutters with a 2-panel wood shutter or removing the shutters entirely from the building. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for this work.
- 6) Denial of proposed colors. Staff recommends Approval of a color scheme to be similar to the existing color of this building and the building across the street or the proposed green with white trim.

Testimony: The Commission discussed the historical use of the building, as the Applicant was not present at the beginning of the case. Mr. Shad swore in Ms. Jessica Liang. Ms. Liang said she would like to repair the existing siding and doors and agreed with Staff comments. She stated if the siding cannot be repaired due to the age and weathering then they would like to replace them with in kind materials to preserve the historic elements.

Ms. Tennor asked Staff about the siding on the front façade of the building and the Staff recommendation. Ms. Holmes explained that Staff recommended repairing the siding in the front of the building so the outline of what was previously there is not lost. However, if the Applicant would like to restore the front façade, then it would be appropriate to remove the siding. Ms. Tennor asked if the stone foundation stops where the carriage door opening may have been or is the wood panel covering the foundation. Ms. Burgess said from the outside it cannot be determined. Ms. Liang is open to having a window or carriage doors in place but they would not open up the carriage doors as an entrance since it is adjacent to Main Street. Ms. Holmes suggested the Applicant look at a nearby example at 3884 Ellicott Mills Drive of this restoration effort for them to determine what is possible. Ms. Holmes said the building has operable doors, but there is a modern door and window behind.

Ms. Tennor asked if the shutters will be eliminated. Ms. Liang said yes, since they are only on a few windows with shutters. Mr. Roth said it would be helpful if the County's Architecture Historian looks at the building interior for documentation. Ms. Zoren said looking at the east side of the building, one can see the distinct window repetition that has been covered up over time. Ms. Liang asked if they would be required to restore any enclosed windows, as the back of the building will be a commercial kitchen. The Commission said they would not be required to, but they would have documentation of what was there if they ever wanted to put them back. Ms. Liang said the interior is down to the bone and the roof is leaking with recent rain. The main entrance will be on the west side where access of the building is optimal.

Ms. Holmes said if the Applicant decides to do a different façade that another application with drawings would need to be submitted to the Commission. Ms. Liang asked if there is any prior documentation about the building's history. Ms. Holmes said there are none that the Commission is aware of. The staff Architectural Historian may contact Ms. Liang for access to the building to determine what is original.

Ms. Liang asked if the gray color with white trim has to be used. Ms. Tennor said white trim has to be used, which will emphasize this building matching a similar style and era building across the street, as shown in an image in the staff report. Mr. Roth pointed out the staff report was fine with the proposed bamboo green.

Ms. Wingate spoke in support of the application and has already been sworn in. She stated that she would like to challenge the Commission that white trim would be appropriate as the property looks to be a carriage or utilitarian building that may have always been painted monochromatically. Ms. Wingate suggested removing a small section of the original painted trim to determine what the original color was

and said the Applicant should be able to use monochromatic color instead of having white trim. Mr. Shad pointed out that the white trim would emphasize the pairing of buildings across the street from the Applicant's building. Ms. Holmes stated that Mr. Short, the architectural historian, agreed with Ms. Wingate regarding a monochromatic color scheme, but that the recommendation for white was based on the request in the application to use a different color. Mr. Taylor summarized the various options discussed, pointing out that the Applicant agreed with the Staff recommendation. Ms. Liang said they would paint the building green with white trim.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to Approve per Staff recommendations. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-65 – 8289 Main Street, Ellicott City (emergency addition)

Exterior alterations/adjustments to previously approved plans

Applicant: Courtney Kehoe

Background & Scope of Work: This building is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1924. According to Joetta Cramm's book, *Historic Ellicott City*, the building was used as the Ellicott City Garage, a Ford agency. The Applicant was approved on August 4, 2016 to restore the front façade of this building using metal windows.

The Applicant now seeks approval to restore the building using wood windows for the front façade. The side and rear metal windows will be restored. The design of the front façade will remain the same. The application states, "transoms to have flat wood on front of building" and a photo of the transom at the Taylor's Department Store building was provided as an example.



Figure 10 - Approved facade restoration plan

Staff Comments: The change from a metal storefront window to a wood storefront window could be considered appropriate, as wood is a historic building material. As the historic storefront no longer exists, it is unknown what the previous materials were, but given the use of the building and the research done to come up with the new design, it was most likely metal. The application states that flat wood will be used, but the photo examples submitted show existing wood storefront windows with a raised profile and bead to the wood. The transom will be leaded glass, similar to the transom at Taylor's Department Store.

Staff does not have a clear understanding of what the proposed change will look like in the end. A lack of detail between the Commission and previous applicant is why the altered window looked different in the end than originally proposed. One of the example photos submitted shows the storefront window at 8090 Main Street. The windows at 8090 Main Street have a wide wood mullion (the vertical element separating the glass), which would not match the approved design on this new storefront, nor would it be appropriate. The metal window was going to be very slim and Staff is concerned that wood would not replicate this design. Staff requires further information on the size of the mullions.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Denial of wood windows without confirmation that the wood will mimic the approved metal design and dimensions.

Testimony: Ms. Holmes stated the application was added as an emergency item and the property was posted 24 hours in advance of the hearing. Ms. Holmes said it was considered an emergency as the owner wants to move displaced businesses into the building. Ms. Kehoe has already been sworn in. Mr. Reich asked if the photo submitted is that of existing Taylor's store. Ms. Kehoe stated the example using 8090-8092 Main Street was only to show wood versus aluminum but it was not meant to mimic the look. The Applicant is open to an aluminum storefront but believes the wood would look better. The transoms above the first floor would match the style of the existing Taylor's store. The windows below the transoms would look like aluminum windows. For clarification, the Applicant was approved in August 2016 for black metal to match the existing windows on the front facade.

Ms. Tennor asked why the Applicant proposed transom windows in place of the approved design. Ms. Zoren asked what the upstairs windows are currently. Ms. Kehoe said the upper windows are approved to be metal and will match the side windows. Mr. Reich said HOPPE window company still makes the steel windows from the 1920's and 1930's period. Ms. Tennor said the windows should be as consistent as possible. Ms. Zoren said the building has an industrial look and metal windows would be a better fit. Mr. Reich said there is not enough detail provided right now.

Ms. Holmes explained the previous Applicant referenced in the report was not Ms. Kehoe, but that when it was approved by the Commission, there were a lot of questions about the dimensions of the profile and the trim and it looked different in the end than expected. Mr. Reich said they need to submit cut sheets and more accurate elevation of what the changes will look like. Ms. Kehoe explained that Great Panes will be making the transoms, so it will look like the photo provided of Taylor's Department Store. Ms. Tennor said the Commission has not approved that design.

Mr. Shad recommended Ms. Kehoe withdraw the application so that the Commission does not have to deny the application. Ms. Holmes clarified that the Commission has already approved an application for this building and that product specification sheets were submitted and approved on August 4, 2016. Ms. Holmes said they can proceed with that approval if they build according to that application and spec sheets, but if they want to use something different they will need another approval. Ms. Burgess suggested rather than withdrawing the application, Ms. Kehoe should continue it into the next September 15th emergency meeting. Ms. Holmes said the Applicant should return with more window specifications for the Commission to review and the drawings need to be updated to show the difference in any window proportions.

Motion: There was no motion. The application will be continued on the next emergency meeting on September 15th, 2016.

16-66 – 8098 Main Street, Ellicott City (emergency addition), HO-52

Replace front door, tax credit pre-approval, Façade Improvement funds.

Applicant: Jackie Everett

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District and is also listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-52, Patapsco National Bank. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to replace the front door, which was damaged in the July 30 flood. The previously existing door was not the original door and was not historic or architecturally appropriate for the building.



Figure 12 - Conditions after flood



Figure 11 - Close up of door

The Applicant proposes to install a full view wood and glass door, similar to a door on a neighboring building, shown below. This style of door would be the Applicant's first choice. Staff suggested the Applicant consider using a pair of 8 lite wood French doors, painted white, to match the historic window pattern on the building. The 8 lite doors shown below is one found by Staff online and does not represent a product officially picked out by the Applicant, but is similar to what Staff is recommending.

The third option, also recommended by Staff, is for a pair of 6 lite over 2 or 1 panel French doors. This style of door is seen on a historic bank building of a similar style located in Sandy Spring.



Figure 13 - Suggested door style, option #2



Figure 14 - Proposed new door, option #1



Figure 15 - Suggested door style, option #3

Staff Comments: The previously existing door was not historic as it was a replacement door after the original was lost due to a previous flood. Chapter 6.G of the Guidelines states that paneled wooden doors are appropriate and recommends, “replace inappropriate modern doors with doors of an appropriate style. If documentary evidence of the original door is available, choose a new door similar to the original. Otherwise, use a door appropriate to the period and style of the building. The County Architectural Historian has found an image that shows the original door was a solid paneled door and was most likely wood. However, Staff understands the emergency nature of this application and that obtaining a door similar to the original would take too much time at this point. Staff finds the pair of 8 lite French doors would be an appropriate style, as would the 6 lite over 1 or 2 panel French doors. The 8 lite and 6 lite doors will replicate the historic window pattern found on the building and comply with the recommendations in the Guidelines as they are appropriate to the period and style of the building, which was done in the Greek Revival style.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of options 2 or 3; the paired 8 lite French doors or the 6 lite over 2 panel French doors, in wood painted white. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of two quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete and availability of funds. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Jackie Everett. Ms. Everett said figure 13 is made by Simpson Door Company and requires a special order that would take six to eight weeks. Currently, there is no door with the air conditioner running and Ms. Everett cannot wait eight weeks. However, Ms. Everett said the same door is available in one full lite. Ms. Everett requested approval of the single pane glass door. Ms. Holmes explained that Figure 13 was only shown as an example of what the door should look like and is not a suggestion to use that brand. Ms. Holmes also spoke with a door retailer in Millersville who said a ten lite door is more available than eight lite depending on the size which would take about one to two weeks. Ms. Everett is fine with either a ten lite or eight lite, but her main concern is the timeframe required for orders. Mr. Reich asked what size the door is. Ms. Everett said the doors are double doors each at 3 feet wide by 6 foot 8 inches tall. Ms. Tennor said an option would be to get full glass door then install exterior mullions to make it look like a true divided lite door. The Applicant is open to that suggestion. Mr. Shad recommended finding an old door at Second Chance that could be reused since the door opening is a standard size door. Ms. Everett explained that the companies she called asked her if she needed a pre-hung door or just the door and she thought just the door. Ms. Zoren pointed out that the frame looks damaged and that she will probably need a new frame. The Commission and Staff discussed 10 lites versus 15 lites. Ms. Holmes pointed out that ten lite would reflect the surrounding window style. Mr. Reich said that for timeframe purposes, the Applicant should get the single lite door and add external mullions. Mr. Lewis confirmed with the Commission that the Applicant can use a 10 lite door if she can find one. The Commission confirmed that was correct.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to Approve single lite wood door painted white with provisions to add mullions later to match the pattern on the rest of the building, per staff approval. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-67 – 8141, 8143, 8147 Main Street, Ellicott City (emergency addition)

Exterior alterations. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: John M. Fisher

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District, but does not contain a historic structure. According to SDAT the building dates to 1987. The building sustained damage in the July 30th flood. The Applicant proposes to replace eight broken windows on the rear of the building with white Andersen Series 100 composite windows made from Fibrex. The previously existing windows were wood. The Applicant also proposes to replace one front door with a full lite wood door to match the previously existing door and replace one set of wood double fill lite doors to match the previously existing. The doors will be painted to match the existing trim color, a cocoa brown and forest green.

Staff Comments: The Applicant proposes to replace the damaged/missing windows on the rear of the building facing the river with a composite window. The rear of the building is not visible from a public way and the building is not historic. The replacement of the former wood windows with a composite window complies with Chapter 6.H recommendations, “vinyl windows may be acceptable for modern additions to historic building if the addition is to the rear of the building with little visibility from public ways or neighboring properties.” The building is modern, it is not historic and the composite window is more appropriate than vinyl. The rear of the building cannot be seen from the public way as it backs up to the river.



The damaged front doors will be replaced in-kind to match the existing with full lite wood doors, painted to match the existing colors. This item is Routine Maintenance and qualifies for the Façade Improvement Program Funds.



Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of two quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete and availability of funds. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Ms. Holmes stated that the property was posted 24 hours prior to the meeting. Mr. Shad swore in Mr. John Fisher. Mr. Taylor asked why this is on the emergency agenda. Ms. Holmes said this build was damaged in the July flood, as the Staff report shows the building is missing front doors. Mr. Reich asked for clarity of the photos submitted. Ms. Burgess stated the photos are both of the front doors of Mr. Fisher's building that were damaged.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve per the Staff recommendations for the windows and door replacement. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ellicott City Updates:

There was an introduction of Ms. Renee Novak who has been hired to manage the Preservation Resource Center. The Center is established on Main Street for owners, in order to assist them in finding contractors and walk them through the rebuilding process. She will help Ms. Burgess and Ms. Holmes to the channel property owners HPC application process. Ms. Novak previously worked for Maryland Historical Trust and has experience in the State tax credit program. Ms. Novak is currently staffed for 24 hours per week until May 2017. Mr. Reich asked what will be Ms. Novak's role at the Resource Center. Ms. Novak said she will provide technical guidance, hold workshops, and connect property owners with contractors and architects. The specifics will still need to be determined since the Center is just starting.

Ms. Burgess spoke about Mr. Nick Redding, the Executive Director of Preservation Maryland, who has been a great help the past few weeks. Ms. Burgess explained that through his organization's efforts, Elevated Element, an Owings Mills based business who does drone work, has captured photos of Ellicott City to create a 3D model of the town that will measure to 2 millimeters. This work is being done pro-bono and will be available to Ms. Novak and the County to help in the restoration and documentation efforts. Elevated Element will also return in a few years after the rebuilding effort has completed to rescan the area.

Ms. Burgess said Ellicott City is now open down to Court Avenue and Ellicott Mills Drive. She explained there are plans to reopen all of Main Street in the next couple weeks and provided an update on the work being done. She said that BGE is replacing the main gas lines under the streets. There are temporary repairs using asphalt to cover up holes allowing accessibility before master planning takes place. A lot of building foundations have been secured. The Commission inquired if the power lines were being buried. Mr. Taylor said the issue is there is a lot of granite underground which makes it difficult to install utilities lines.

Other Business:

Mr. Shad reminded the Commission there will be a vote to elect a new Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary at the October 6th, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Bennett said the Department of Inspections, Licensing and Permit (DILP) has been approved to have same day permits. Ms. Burgess has reminded DILP to refer applicants to Historic Preservation Commission for pre-approval first prior to going to DILP.

Mr. Taylor asked if there was anyone who will not be attending the October 6th meeting and does not want to be elected to the Chairman or Vice Chairman position to speak up. No one spoke.

Mr. Roth moved to adjourn. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 9:01pm.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Allan Shad, Chair

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Samantha Holmes, Preservation Planner

Yvette Zhou, Recording Secretary